

Studying the primary cited reference reveals that it teaches against the combining. In discussing Fig. 7 prior art, Iwakura ('545) says "The conventional device B has shortcomings that the provision of the receiver 01 is not only expensive, but is inconvenient because the device B cannot be compactly folded with thin form and bulk." ('545) is teaching the thin flat structure that can be folded into pairs in a carrier 30 (Fig.5). The proposed combination adds the bulk that '545 teaches away from. This is evidence of unobviousness.

Examiner provides no evidence in the prior art for teaching this combining.

It is respectfully submitted that the application is improperly rejected for want of a prima facie showing of obviousness.

It is respectfully submitted that the invention as claimed is unobvious over the prior art for the following reasons:


Since the prior art combination lacks elements of the claims, is opposite teaching, and does not function as intended, it is therefor unobvious. In re Clinton, 527 F. 2d, 188 USPQ365 (CCPA 1976).

The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art, and not based on Applicant's disclosure. In re Vaeck, 947 F.2d 488, USPQ 2d 1438 (Fed.Cir. 1991).

The showing of suggestion to combine must be clear and particular. Examiner has made no such showing. In re Dembiczak, 175 F.3d 994, 50 USPQ 2d. 1614 (Fed. Cir.1999). In view of the foregoing, it is urged that the Examiner withdraw the rejections and allow the claims. If there are any comments, questions or suggestions to be made, the Examiner is respectfully invited to telephone the applicant's representative at the telephone number given below for prompt disposition of any still outstanding matters.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Alvin S. Blum, Reg.#30448

(954) 462-5006